

## REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112, second paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3-7 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicants are amending Claims 1, 3, 6, 17 and 18. It is respectfully submitted that, as amended, these claims are clear and not indefinite.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112, first paragraph

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 5 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, in the Office Action with regard to independent Claim 2, the Examiner contends that the specification "does not reasonably provide enablement for depositing drop composition in grooves that are not part of the surface having affinity ..., nor does the specification reasonably provide enablement for etching holes, such as contact holes into thin films having 'affinity'." Applicants respectfully disagree with this contention.

In contrast to the Examiner's contention, the specification does not state that the groove or hole must have a liquid affinity. For example, the specification teaches to form a groove by a

selective plasma treatment and then form a pattern by drop discharging means (see e.g. paragraph bridging pages 8-9 of the verified English translation of the specification of the present application). With regard to formation of a hole by plasma treatment, see for example Fig. 10D and the description thereof starting on page 23, line 9 of the verified English translation of the specification. This section does not state that the hole must have a liquid affinity. Hence, independent Claim 2 and the claims dependent thereon are enabled by the specification of the present application.

Further, while Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicants are amending Claims 2 and 16-18. It is respectfully submitted that, as amended, these claims clearly comply with the enablement requirement.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102 - Seki

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1, 3-4 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Seki et al. (EP 0989778). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicants believe that the Examiner's rejection is based on a misunderstanding of the claimed material and the present invention.

In order to clarify the claimed invention, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1. For example, amended independent Claim 1 recites the feature of "irradiating a selected portion of the liquid-repellent thin film with plasma from a first nozzle so that the selected portion has a liquid affinity."

In contrast, Seki does not appear to disclose or suggest a selective plasma irradiation

treatment for providing a liquid affinity. Seki also does not appear to disclose or suggest use of two nozzles.

Therefore, Seki does not disclose or suggest the method of independent Claim 1, and Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Seki.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103 - Seki and Di Dio

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 5 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Seki et al. and further in view of Di Dio (U.S. 2004/0152329). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, Seki does not appear to disclose or suggest the selective treatment of the claimed invention. Seki also does not appear to disclose or suggest use of two nozzles.

With regard to the Examiner's citation of Di Dio, Di Dio does not appear to disclose or suggest the above claimed features. Further, it is not seen how Di Duo can be combined with Seki to arrive at the claimed method, other than by hindsight reconstruction. The Examiner's motivation in the rejection seems to be that it would be obvious to try the method of Di Duo, not that there is a motivation to combine these references. This is improper, and as a result, the combination and rejection based thereon are both improper.

Therefore, neither cited reference disclose or suggest the method of independent Claim 2, Claim 2 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102 - Yoshikawa

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-4 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshikawa et al. (U.S. 6,228,435). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 1 recites “irradiating a selected portion of the liquid - repellent thin film with plasma...” Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Yoshikawa of irradiating, much less selective irradiation with plasma.

Independent Claim 2 recites “selectively forming a groove or hole...by selectively treating the thin film with a plasma...” Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Yoshikawa of this feature.

Therefore, Yoshikawa does not disclose or suggest the method of independent Claims 1 and 2, and Claims 1 and 2 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Yoshikawa.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103 - Yoshikawa

The Examiner further rejects Claims 6-7 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, each of these claims is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Request for More Detailed Rejections

Applicants request that the Examiner specifically point out where in the references each of the claimed features is shown. In the pending Office Action, the Examiner only refers to sections in the references at the end of the rejection which makes it very difficult to find and understand where the Examiner believes each claimed element is shown in the reference.

#### Cancellation of Claims

Applicants are canceling non-elected Claims 8-15 and 19-22 without prejudice or disclaimer to pursuing these claims in a divisional application.

#### New Claims

Applicants are adding new Claims 23-30. It is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

#### Amendment to the Specification

Applicants are also amending the specification at the paragraph at page 3, line 20 - page 4, line 2. This amendment is supported by at least original Claim 5 as filed in the present application. Hence, no new matter is being added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered and allowed.

### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, extension of time, or IDS, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 9, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568